## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

│ │ MARTIN MARSHAL,

v.

11 ||

DANELA AND JOLYNN OLDFIELD,

Respondent.

Petitioner.

No. C14-05346 RBL/KLS

ORDER TO FILE A COMPLETE
APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN
FORMA PAUPERIS AND AN AMENDED
HABEAS CORPUS PETITION NAMING
A PROPER RESPONDENT

This petition for a writ of habeas corpus had been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Local Magistrate Judge Rules 3 and 4. Petitioner, Martin Marshal, is attempting to challenge a state conviction and sentence. He originally filed the action as a civil rights claim and the Clerk's Office correctly opened the action as a Habeas Corpus petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The Clerk's Office sent Mr. Marshal a habeas in forma pauperis application and a habeas corpus form petition. Dkt. 2. Mr. Marshal returned only the first page of the *in forma pauperis* application and when he filled out the form petition he listed his alleged victim and her mother as respondents. Dkt. 3 and 4.

ORDER - 1

Mr. Marshal must to start over. The Clerk's Office is directed to send him another packet. Mr. Marshal must fill out and return the entire *in forma pauperis* application. Mr. Marshal also must fill out another habeas corpus petition because alleged victims and their mothers are not the proper party to respond to a federal habeas corpus petition.

The proper respondent is "the person having custody of the person detained." 28 U.S.C. § 2243. This person is usually the superintendent of the facility where petitioner, Mr. Marshal, is incarcerated. Mr. Marshal's failure to name the correct party deprives this Court of personal jurisdiction. *See Stanley v. California Supreme Court*, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994).

The Court Orders Mr. Marshal to file an amended petition on the form provided by the Court. The amended petition will act as a complete substitute for the original. The amended petition is due on or before July 11, 2014. Failure to comply with this order will result in a Report and Recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order and lack of in personam jurisdiction over respondent.

The Clerk is directed to mail a copy of this Order to petitioner and note the **July 11**, **2014**, deadline on the court's calendar.

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2014.

Karen L. Strombom

United States Magistrate Judge